

MINUTES OF THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
J. MARTIN GRIESEL CONFERENCE ROOM
April 15, 2005
9:00AM

CALL TO ORDER

Caleb Faux called the meeting to order

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

Caleb Faux, Terry Hankner, Deborah Holston, Jacquelyn McCray, Donald Mooney, Curt Paddock and James Tarbell

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING STAFF

Margaret Wuerstle, Renee Christon, Felix Bere, Katherine Keough-Jurs, Caroline Kellam, Rodney Ringer and Jennifer Walke

LAW DEPARTMENT

Julia Carney

MINUTES

Minutes of the April 1, 2005 Meeting were presented.

Motion:	Ms. Holston motioned to approvet the minutes
Second:	Ms. Hankner
Vote:	All ayes (5-0), motion carried

Mr. Mooney and Mr. Tarbel arrived at 9:10 AM

CONSENT ITEMS

ITEM #1 A report and recommendation on an Ordinance Authorizing the Skywalk Demolition Agreement for demolition of the Fountain Square/Fifth Street Skywalk Bridge and the release by the City of certain easements.

ITEM #2 A report and recommendation on the Authorizing the Granting of Easements for the Board of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, Ohio through Mt. Airy Forest.

ITEM #3 A report and recommendation on a Re-Plat of Lot 9 of the I.A.M.S. Research Park East Subdivision – Phase V, Techsolve, Inc., creating Lot 9A, located at 6715 Steger Drive southeast of the Paddock Road and Seymour Avenue intersection in Bond Hill.

ITEM #4 A report and recommendation concerning the acceptance and confirmation of an easement for wellhead protection and two easements for the installation and sampling of monitoring wells in accordance with a Restrictive Covenant and Grant of Easement from the City of Fairfield, Ohio.

ITEM #5 A report and recommendation on an ordinance to accept and confirm the dedication of certain real property to public use for street purposes as an addition to Ferguson Road and accepting and confirming the dedication of an easement for bicycle/pedestrian facility in accordance with the plats designated "Plat of Subdivision, Glenpark - Section 1."

ITEM #6 A report and recommendation on the sale of surplus City-owned property located at 1303-1305 Pendleton Street in the community of Pendleton, commonly known as Hamilton County Auditor's Parcel Numbers 75-2-97 & 98.

ITEM #7 A report and recommendation on the sale of an unimproved portion of Kanauga Street adjacent to 3714 Kanauga Street in Madisonville.

Motion: Terry Hankner motioned to approve Consent Items #1 – #7
Second: Jacqueline. Mc Cray
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

DISCUSSION ITEMS

ITEM #8 Final Development Plan for Marburg Square in Oakley presented by Katherine Keough-Jurs, Senior City Planner.

BACKGROUND

The City's Hearing Examiner approved the Concept Plan on July 18, 2003 for Planned Development (PD) District #37; Marburg Square is located at the northwest corner of Wasson Road and Marburg Avenue. The Concept Plan was a development plan for an active adult community in Oakley consisting of townhomes, multi-family dwellings, two five-story condominium structures, two three-to-four story condominium structures, all sitting above a 192 space parking garage, and also surrounding a community building and pool. The total number of proposed units in this development plan is 119 units.

The Final Development Plan has been drastically changed from the Concept Plan. It was determined that public funding would not be available for this project and therefore, it was necessary to change the scope of this project. Staff passed out letters of support received from the Oakley Community Council who voted on April 5, 2005 to accept the plans. In addition, a letter of initial approval from the Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) was handed out.

Katherine explained that under Section 1429-15 of the Zoning Code, the City Planning Commission may approve a final Development Plan for a PD District on consideration of (8) findings:

Zoning Code § 1429-15:

- (a) Consistency.** The final development plan is consistent with the purpose of the Planned Development District Regulations;
- (b) Adequate Streets.** The existing and proposed internal and external streets are adequate to serve the proposed development and properly interconnect with the surrounding existing road network;
- (c) Adequate Infrastructure.** The proposed infrastructure, utilities and all other proposed facilities are adequate to serve the planned development and properly interconnect with existing public facilities;
- (d) Covenant.** The Department of Buildings and Inspections must require covenants by the owner of the property in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor to be recorded indicating that the open spaces, parking areas, walks and drives as shown on the plan may not be used for any other purpose. The owner must further covenant that all streets, common areas, common utilities and other common facilities remain in common ownership by all owners of any interest in the land or buildings in the Planned Development other than a leasehold interest of less than five years. (See § 1441-07).
- (e) Release of Covenants.** The City Manager, on receipt of a recommendation from the Director of Building and Inspections, may recommend the covenant be terminated in the following instances: the particular use requiring a covenant is no longer necessary and the building permits have been terminated, or the condition or conditions requiring such covenant are no longer applicable.
- (f) Compatibility.** The proposed uses, location and arrangement of structures, lots, parking areas, walks, open spaces, landscaping, lighting and appurtenant facilities are compatible with the surrounding land uses;

(g) Sufficiency of Legal Documents. Proposed covenants, easements and other provisions meet development standards; and

(h) Sufficiency of Provisions for Maintenance of Common Areas. Open space and common areas are identified and provisions have been made for the care and maintenance of such areas.

The City Planning Commission made the following findings on this project:

(a) Consistency.

Plan is consistent with the purpose of the PD District because it allows for more efficient development of property. This development is more creative with the use of the space, creating greater flexibility in housing options and it creates a common open space.

(b) Adequate Streets

The development has an adequate street network because it allows access to each unit from both front and rear of the unit (outer ring of units from main streets and road, inner ring of units from main roadway and roadway surrounding greenspace) and it provides a main entrance from Wasson and an auxiliary entrance from Eastern Hills Lane.

(c) Adequate Infrastructure

The development has an adequate infrastructure because MSD has given conditional approval based on sewer credits being provided and remediation through a contract with Episcopal Retirement Homes. All sewers will be privately owned and maintained so as to not interfere with the surrounding capacity. The Ackerman Group has been working with CWW to ensure that there will be no interference with water mains. Proposed underground detention facilities will provide protection to surrounding properties. Westfield Avenue will be vacated for the agreed-upon price of \$30,000 and Real Estate has allowed The Ackerman Group to wait until the final development plan is approved before they close.

(d) Covenant.

The Law department has indicated that the covenants are acceptable.

(e) Release of Covenants

This item does not apply.

(f) Compatibility

The proposed uses and arrangement are compatible with surrounding land uses because the project is residential, as is much of surrounding neighborhood. The scale and character of the project is similar to the surrounding area and is more in scale than the concept plan. The outer ring buildings face the neighborhood by being directed toward the surrounding streets of Marburg, Wasson and Eastern Hills, allowing the development to become a part of the neighborhood. This project will strengthen the Oakley neighborhood by adding yet another housing option and encouraging young professionals, seniors and empty nesters as future owners.

(g) Sufficiency of Legal Documents

All legal documents will be reviewed by the Law Department for sufficiency.

(h) Sufficiency of Provisions for Maintenance of Common Areas

The Ackermann Group has provided the City's Law Department with a draft copy of the covenant creating a Unit Owners Association and indicating that all property in the development including streets, open space, parking areas and walkways will be owned and maintained by the association. The Law Department has reviewed this covenant and has approved it's form.

Staff stated that the proposed Marburg Square development is in compliance and consistent with the purpose of Planned Development District Regulations and the previously accepted Concept Plan.

Dobbs Ackermann and Lasserre Bradley addressed the Commission. Mr. Ackermann stated that the Ackerman Group has been working on the project for (3) three years and after working with the City concerning financing it made sense for them to change directions. They decided to go from a public/private partnership to private partnership and a plan that is in keeping with the community desires. In addition, they decided on using the same design principles as in the community of Mariemount.

Mr. Paddock asked about the total number of units and Mr. Ackerman responded by stating that the number of units would be between 49 and 76 units. Through a marketing strategy, Mr. Ackermann found a huge demand for 1,000 sq. ft. units at a price range of \$200,000. The Ackermann Group wants to keep the units within the price range of the Oakley community. Oakley at this time has a property price range of \$140,000 to \$700,000. The development plan allows for an 1800 sq. ft. townhouse unit or two flats. The mix of these flats and townhouse units will determine the final total number of units for the development.

Motion: Donald Mooney motioned to approve the Final Development Plan as presented.

Second: Jacqueline McCray

Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

ITEM #9 A report and recommendation on a Zone change for 54 lots in North Fairmont on Ermann, Menke, Randall, Yoast and Guenthers Avenues.

Felix Bere, Senior City Planner presented this zone change request. On February 13, 2004, City Council approved the New Zoning Code. The Code's enactment resulted in a change of zoning classification for these 54 parcels from a SF-4 Moderately High Density Single-Family District (formerly R-3) to a SF-2 High Density Single-Family District.

On December 17, 2004, City Planning Commission (CPC) upheld the staff recommendation to disapprove a rezoning from SF-2 to SF-6 for a larger area that included the 54 parcels. The main reasons for the denial were: (a) those who requested the zone change were not a majority of property owners in the area, and (b) only a property owner can petition for the rezoning of property he/she owns. Staff asserted that when the two conditions were satisfied a new petition for a zone change could be considered. A petition for rezoning signed by five of the nine (55.6 %) property owners had now been submitted.

Previously the 54 parcels were zoned R-3 Two-Family District. The R-3 zoning permitted single and two-family dwellings with a minimum lot area of 4000 square feet per dwelling unit while the SF-2 Single-Family High-Density District allows only one single-family unit per parcel with a minimum lot area of 2,000 square feet. The SF-4 district, the equivalent of the old R-3 district, permits single and two-family dwellings with a minimum lot area of 4000 square feet per dwelling unit. The SF-6 Single-Family Medium Density District, the equivalent of the old R2 zone, permits a single-family housing structure with a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet.

Existing Use: The study area includes 54 parcels (fronting Ermann, Menke, Randall, Yoast, and Guenther Avenues) in North Fairmount. The area developed with predominantly single-family residences many of which are on an acre of land and are intertwined with steep hillsides. The steep hillsides render the area highly susceptible to slippage and landslides. The majority (5 of 9) of the property owners who live in the subject area have now petitioned the City to change the zoning of this area from SF-2 to SF-6.

One of the four property owners who did not sign the petition to rezone property is Mr. Al Wittich who owns Moonlight Properties LLC. At the CPC meeting of December 17, 2004, Mr. Wittich did not support the change to SF-6 citing non-conformity to development plans he was working on for his property, but he

was in support of rezoning to SF-4. Mr. Al Wittich was present and stated that he had not been notified regarding the zone change for the area. Mr. Faux asked if notices had been sent out and Margaret Wuerstle responded that they had. Mr Faux then informed Mr. Wittich that the City is not obligated to call individuals. The City is only obligated to notify by mail. Mr. Wittich also stated that he feels that he has not had enough time to examine the SF-6 zone change and how it impacts his proposal for 55 units located on the vacant lots that he owns. He stated that he was opposed to the SF-6 designation but that he could support a change to the SF-4 designation.

Mr. Eric Russo, of the Hillside Trust, stated that he is in support of the zone change to SF-6 because of the 40% slope on the properties. More density on the hillsides raises concern for landslides and erosion issue.

Mr. Bockhaus stated that he was speaking for the homeowners that live on their property and that they are in favor of the SF-6 zone change.

Kathy Brockhaus stated that all of the homeowners own at least two lots for a total of, 6000 square feet.

Motion: Donald Mooney motioned to approve the zone change to SF-6.
Second: Deborah Holston
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

ITEM #10 Zoning Code Text Amendments on the following sections:

§1401-01-B9 Definition of Building. (Alternative Language)

Proposed Text Amendment:

“Building” means a structure enclosed within exterior walls, built, erected and framed of a combination of materials, having a roof to form a structure for the shelter ~~any structure having a roof supported by columns or walls for the housing or enclosure~~ of persons, animals, or property of any kind and excluding any structure designed as a house-trailer or other type trailer.

REASON: The Department of Buildings & Inspections has interpreted the definition of “building” to mean that unenclosed areas under a roof or awning are part of the main building rather than being an outdoor area. This interpretation has raised concerns regarding commercial establishments constructing outdoor eating and/or drinking areas.

In response to a question on the difference between the existing language in the Code and the proposed language, Julia Carney replied that the new language takes out any reference to columns and that a gazebo would be considered a structure and not a building.

Motion: Donald Mooney motioned to accept alternative language
Second: Deborah Holston
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

§1401-01-O6 New Definition of Outdoor Eating and Drinking Area

After discussion on whether outdoor drinking areas should be prohibited in the City the Planning Commission determined that outdoor drinking areas should be permitted in the City with appropriate regulations to protect the neighborhoods. The Commission requested that this section be held until revised language could be developed for regulating outdoor drinking areas.

§1419-21 Limited or Full Service Restaurant

The Planning Commission felt that outdoor drinking areas should be allowed as a conditional use because there are areas in the City that are appropriate for such a use. Arnold's restaurant was discussed as an example of an outdoor drinking area that worked well.

In addition, a suggestion was made to remove the word "live" in section 1419-21(f) because it was felt that outdoor music did not have to be "live" to have a tremendous negative impact on a neighborhood. Mr. Carl Ubelacker pointed out that section 1419-21(f) as written would prohibit a mime from performing but allow loud recorded music in outdoor areas.

The Commission determined that the two text amendments that had been proposed for this section did not reflect the concerns of the Commission and recommended that staff work on the language for outdoor eating areas and also for outdoor drinking areas and bring back alternative language at a later date.

§1409-07 Use Regulations- Commercial Subdistricts

Proposed text Amendment:

Schedule 1409-07: Use Regulations - Commercial Subdistricts

Use Classifications CN-P CN-M CC-P CC-M CC-A CG-A Add'l Regulations

Commercial Uses

Eating and drinking establishments

Drinking establishments ~~L6, L13~~ ~~L6, L13~~ ~~L6~~ P P P See § 1419-21

Restaurants,full serv. L6, L13 L6, L13 L6 P P P See § 1419-21

Restaurants,limited L6, L13 L6, L13 L6 P P P See § 1419-21

The Planning Commission determined that the L6 limitation listed under the CN-P, CN-M and CC-P districts for the Drinking Establishment Use Classification should be removed and the referral to §1419-21 should be added under the additional regulations column. Mr. Faux explained that there had been a great deal of confusion regarding whether outdoor drinking areas were a permitted use in these districts. Removal of the L6 limitation should clear up some of the confusion while the new language for outdoor drinking areas is being prepared.

Motion: Terry Hankner motioned to approve this text amendment

Second: Donald Mooney

Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

§1425-03 Requirements for Off-Street Parking and Loading

The Commission determined that it had been their intention and City Council's intention to allow commercial structures with a total floor area of 2000 sq. ft or less to be exempted from the off-street parking regulations. Furthermore, any structure over 2000 sq. ft. used for commercial purposes is required to provide off-street parking for all floor area and would not be entitled to an exemption. No motion was made on this text amendment as presented.

§1425-19 Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements

After discussion on the text amendment for §1425-03, the following motion was made:

Motion: Donald Mooney motioned to approve Alternative Language #2 for §1425-19 with an additional change to reflect "2000 sq. ft. or less" and to make §1425-03 consistent with §1425-19 Alternative Language #2 and to keep the 10% exemption language in §1425-03

Second: Terry Hankner

Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

The approved language would read as follows:

§ 1425-03. Requirements for Off-Street Parking and Loading.

~~New~~ Off-street parking and loading spaces must be provided for uses that are established, enlarged, extended or moved onto ~~a new~~ any lot after the effective date of these zoning regulations, or of a subsequent rezoning or other amendment establishing or increasing parking or loading requirements for the uses. When ~~a new or~~ an expanded use results in an increase of more than ten percent in the number of currently required parking spaces, additional parking must be provided for the additional space based on the standards of this chapter.

Structures for commercial uses with a total floor area of 2000 square feet or less as determined in §1425-17 Units of Measurement are exempted from the off-street parking requirements. All structures for commercial uses with a total floor area over 2000 square feet shall provide off-street parking and loading spaces as listed in schedule 19A. for floor area as determined in §1425-17 Units of Measurement.

And

§ 1425-19. Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements.

Off-street parking and loading requirements must be provided in accordance with Schedules 1425-19-A and 1425-19-B.

- a) Structures for commercial uses with a total floor area of 2000 square feet or less as determined in §1425-17 Units of Measurement are exempted from the off-street parking requirements. All structures for commercial uses with a total floor area over 2000 square feet shall provide off-street parking and loading spaces as listed in schedule 19A. for floor area as determined in §1425-17 Units of Measurement.
- b) Unless a use is specifically noted under the appropriate use classification heading, the parking and loading requirements apply uniformly to all uses within a use classification.
- c) Off-street parking and loading requirements for uses in the DD Districts are subject to the provisions of Chapter 1411, Downtown Development Districts.
- d) Off-street parking and loading facilities must be made permanently available to the use served.
- e) Where the use is undetermined or the parking requirement is not established in Schedule 1425-19-A, the Director of Buildings and Inspections must determine the probable use and number of spaces required.

§1425-17 Units of Measurement

Proposed text Amendment:

The following rules apply to the determination of required parking:

(a) **Floor Area.** In the case of uses where floor area is the unit for determining the required number of parking spaces, the floor area includes all areas employed by the use including outdoor eating and drinking areas except that such floor area need not include any area used for parking within the principal building and need not include any area used for incidental service storage, installations of mechanical equipment, penthouses housing ventilators and heating systems and similar uses.

REASON: This language was added to ensure that outdoor areas are included in determining the required number of parking spaces.

The language as proposed was acceptable to the Planning Commission

Motion: Jacqueline McCray motioned to approve the language as proposed
Second: Donald Mooney
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

§1445-07 List of Allowable Special Exceptions

Proposed Text Amendment:

Standard	Chapter or § Reference
Buffer Yards along district boundaries	§ 1423-13
Building Placement Requirements	§ 1409-19, 1409-23 21
Commercial Continuity	§ 1411-17
Ground Floor Transparency	§ 1409- 25, 23 1411-21
Location of Parking	§ 1409- 27, 25 , 1425- 17 <u>15</u>
Additional Development Regulations	Chapter 1419
Landscaping and Buffer Yards	Chapter 1423
Parking Lot Landscaping	§ 1425- 34 <u>29</u>
Parking Lot Screening	§ 1425- 29 <u>27</u>

REASON: The proposed changes to the section numbers correct typographical errors. Since allowable Special Exceptions include the entire Chapter of §1423, we do not need to specifically list §1423-13.

Motion: Jacqueline McCray motioned to approve the proposed amendments
Second: Terry Hankner
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

§1409-07 Use Regulations – Commercial Subdistricts

The Schedule in §1409-07 listing the accessory uses that are permitted in the commercial subdistricts refers the reader to L10-(Limitation 10).

Proposed Text Amendment (Alternative Language):

The Language of Limitation 10 should be changed as follows:

L10 Accessory uses determined by the Director of Buildings and Inspections to be customarily incidental to a use of the district are permitted except where expressly prohibited. All others require conditional use approval.

REASON: Drive-through facilities are motor vehicle –oriented establishments. It was clearly the intent of the new code to prohibit motor vehicle-oriented establishments in pedestrian-oriented zoning districts whether the drive-through component was the primary use or incidental to a use.

Gerry Kraus requested that the language be revised to say “except where expressly permitted”. Mr. Faux explained that the Commission tried to build in some flexibility to the Code by allowing the Director of Buildings and Inspections to make interpretations.

Motion: Donald Mooney motioned to approved the alternative language proposed
Second: Jacqueline McCray
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

§1401-01-D9 New Definition of Drive-Through Facility

Proposed Text Amendment:

§1401-01-D9. DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY/ESTABLISHMENT

Any commercial business which by design, type of operation, or nature of business, has as one of its functions the provision of services to a number of motor vehicles or its occupants in a short time span, or the provision of services to the occupants of motor vehicles while they remain in a vehicle.

§ 1401-01-D9 ~~D9~~ D10. Dwelling Unit.

"Dwelling unit" means one or more rooms with a single kitchen designed for occupancy by one family for living and sleeping purposes.

Reason: The Zoning Code regulates Drive –Through Facilities. However, a definition is not in the Code and in certain instances Drive-Through Facilities have been allowed as accessory uses in districts that would otherwise prohibit them. Section 1401-01-D10 is being revised in order to keep the definition section of the Zoning Code in alphabetical order.

The Commission requested that the words "a number of " be removed and "in a short time span" be removed. Also, the Commission suggested that "its occupants" be changed to "their occupants."

The new language would now read as follows:

§1401-01-D9. DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY/ESTABLISHMENT

Any commercial business which by design, type of operation, or nature of business, has as one of its functions the provision of services to motor vehicles or their occupants, or the provision of services to the occupants of motor vehicles while they remain in a vehicle.

§ 1401-01-D9 ~~D9~~ D10. Dwelling Unit.

"Dwelling unit" means one or more rooms with a single kitchen designed for occupancy by one family for living and sleeping purposes.

Motion:	Jacqueline McCray motioned to accept alternative language as corrected by the Commission
Second:	Deborah Holston
Vote:	All ayes (7-0), motion carried

§1421-01

Accessory Residential Structures

Proposed Text Amendment:

Structures ancillary to a principal structure are considered accessory structures. This section establishes regulations for residential accessory structures. All accessory structures must be located, developed and operated in compliance with the following:

(a) **Location.** Accessory structures, ~~other than fences and walls, flagpoles, lamp posts, arbors, trellis, etc.~~ are not permitted in a front yard or a side yard except for fences and walls, flagpoles, lamp posts, arbors, trellis, birdbaths, decorative fountains, or other similar uses structures as determined appropriate by the Director of Buildings and Inspections.

Reason: Language in a zoning code must be as exact as possible. Words such as "etc" can make consistent implementation of the code difficult and present issues that may not have been considered.

During discussion of this item the Commission requested that staff also differentiate between the terms walls, retaining walls, and structures. Margaret Wuerstle indicated that staff would work on these items and bring language to the Commission for consideration.

Motion: Don Mooney motioned to approve the alternative language as proposed
Second: Jacqueline McCray
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

§1427-03-N1 Nonconforming Sign

Proposed Text Amendment:

A nonconforming structure may not be moved, expanded or altered, except in the manner provided in this section or unless required by law.

(a) **Repair, Maintenance, Alterations and Expansion.** A nonconforming structure, may be repaired, maintained, altered or enlarged; provided, however, that no such repair, maintenance, alteration or expansion shall either create any new nonconformity or increase the degree of the existing nonconformity of all or any part of such structure.

(b) **Moving.** A nonconforming structure, including nonconforming signs, may not be moved, in whole or in part, for any distance whatsoever, to any other location on the same lot or to any other lot unless the entire structure conforms to the regulations of the zoning district in which it is located after being moved.

Reason: The Code must be clear that nonconforming signs are nonconforming structures and therefore cannot be moved, unless the sign conforms to the regulations of the zoning district in which it is located.

Motion: Terry Hankner motioned to approve the alternative language as proposed
Second: Curt Paddock
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

§1405-05 Use Regulations –Residential Multi-family Districts- Accessory Uses

Proposed Text Amendment:

REMOVE THE L7 LIMITATION FROM THE RM-2.0 AND THE RM-1.2 DISTRICTS FOR THE FOOD MARKETS USE CLASSIFICATION. ADD THE FOLLOWING NEW LIMITATION L15 TO THE RM-2.0 AND THE RM-1.2 DISTRICTS FOR THE FOOD MARKET USE CLASSIFICATION:

L15 Permitted on the ground floor in multi-family buildings with a minimum of 50 dwelling units, occupying less than 1200 square feet and having a separate exterior entrance; more space requires a conditional use approval.

Reason: As currently written, the Code would allow existing or new single-family, and smaller multi-family structures such as two, three, and four unit structures, to convert a room or a unit to a commercial use. This is a concern especially for food markets in residential districts. Potentially a single family home could convert one room or a triplex could convert a unit to a food market.

The Planning Commission wanted to ensure that a developer could obtain a variance from the 50 dwelling unit requirement should a food market be appropriate in a development with less than 50 dwelling units.

Motion: Jacqueline McCray motioned to approve the language as proposed
Second: Curt Paddock
Vote: All ayes (7-0), motion carried

Margaret A. Wuerstle, AICP
Chief Planner
Department of Community
Development & Planning

Caleb Faux, Chair
City Planning Commission

Date: _____

Date: _____